

REMARKS

Applicants have done their best to respond to a restriction requirement that is confusing. There is no reason to group Formula I with IIa, but not with IIb, IIc or IId. It is believed that the Examiner meant to provide applicants with the option of combining Formula I with one of Formula IIa, IIb, IIc, or IId and this is how the following response is structured.

Thus, applicants elect, with traverse, compound claims 1, 2, 4 and 7-16 and method claims 17-18, as believed to be defined in Group II, for examination in this application. In addition, claims 3-6 have been amended to depend from claim 1 and for the reasons that follow, it is believed that claims 3 and 5-6 should also be examined with the Group II claims at this time. As none of these amendments introduces new matter, applicants respectfully request that all amendments be entered at this time.

It is respectfully submitted that the compounds of Formula I of Group I of the present invention are PKB inhibitors composed of a peptide substrate mimetic preferably conjugated with an isoquinoline derivatives which are ATP mimetics. It was surprisingly found that conjugation of the inhibitory substrate peptide mimetic with the ATP mimetic increases the inhibitory capability of the PKB inhibitors. Formula I represents the isoquinoline derivative which is conjugated to the peptide or peptidomimetic. According to Formula I, the position in the peptide (Z) in which isoquinoline is connected via L is not specified and is not limited to a specific position of the peptide. Therefore, Claim 1 is generic to each of Formulae IIa to IId such that the compounds represented by formulae IIa-IId are all within the scope of Formula I of claim 1 as preferred embodiments. To more clearly recite this relationship, claims 3-6 have been amended to now depend from claim 1. Thus, these claims should be examined with the Group I claims at this time.

Furthermore, the molecules of claims 7-14 correspond to Formula I and, in particular, to structures obtained from Formula IIb (where L is connected to R5). Although it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-18 should be examined together at this time, if an election of one of Formulae IIa through IId is required to combine with the compounds of Formula I, applicants elect the structure of Formula IIb (rather than IIa) so that claims 7-18 can be examined together with Formula I and Group II claims 1, 2 and 4.

Finally, as to claims 17-18, it is understood that these claims will be withdrawn at present but that it will be allowed when the compound claim 1 from which they depend are

allowed. To the extent that a method species is required, applicants elect autoimmune diseases. It is submitted that the allowance of compound claim 1 will render all species of claims 17-18 in condition for allowance.

The same is believed to be true for claim 19: that claim 19 should also be currently withdrawn but re-joined when claim 1 is allowed as it is directed to another method of use of the compounds of claim 1.

Again, the invention is directed to PKB inhibitors of Formula I where there are a variety of different structures (of Formulae IIa through IId) that can be present in the structure of Formula I. For this reason, all of claims 1-16 should be examined at this time.

It is respectfully submitted that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated.

Date: _____

7-25-06

Respectfully submitted,


Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 28765
(212) 294-3311